APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/848,987	05/03/2001	Mary A. Holstege	021756-016000US	8754

51206   7590   12/13/2007
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
8TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER
NAWAZ, ASAD M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/13/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/848,987	HOLSTEGE
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Asad M. Nawaz	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _10 October 2007_.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-10,12-24 and 26-35_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-10,12-24 and 26-35_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

ETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to the RCE received 10/10/07. Claims 1, 15, 29, 30, and 35

have been amended. Claims 11 and 25 were previously canceled. No other claims have been

added, canceled, or amended. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 12-24, and 26-35 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3.   Claims 1-3, 5, 8-10 and 12-17, 19, 22-24 and 26-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

as being anticipated by Maslov (US Patent No 6,538,673).

As to claim 1, Maslov teaches a method for monitoring multiple online resources in

different formats, the method comprising the steps: identifying a plurality of online resources to

monitor, the plurality of online resources being stored in a plurality of formats, at least one of the

plurality of online resources including data in a non-strict architectural structure; (Abstract; figs

2-4; col 3, lines 25-40; col 4, lines 40-65)

converting each of the plurality of online resource to a strict formatted file having a

common format, wherein data in the plurality of formats of the plurality of online resources is

converted into a strict architectural structure in the respective strict formatted file; (Abstract; figs

2-4; col 3, lines 25-40 (XSLT can be used to convert HTML to XML and vice versa); col 4, lines

40-65)

after converting to the strict formatted file, identifying relevant data based on the strict

architectural structure of the data in the strict formatted files using an analytic parser, and

determining whether the identified relevant data has been altered. (figs 2-4; col 3, lines 25-40;

col 4, lines 40-65; col 6, lines 5-13)

and comparing the identified relevant data to a most recent archived copy of the

identified relevant data. (fig 1; col 4, lines 41-53)

Claims 15, 30 and 35 are rejected for essentially being the system for the method taught

in claim 1.

Claim 29 is rejected for essentially being a method as taught in claim 1 except that data

has been remotely updated, a limitation that is taught by Maslov. (fig 6; col 11, lines 4-39)

As to claims 2 and 16, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 and the system of claim 15

wherein at least one of the plurality of online resources is a HyperText Markup Language

application. (col 12, lines 35-41)

As to claim 3, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 and that at least one of the online

resources is a non-HyperText Markup Language application. (col 4, lines 47-52)

Claim 17 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 3 above.

As to claim 5, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 and that an Extensible Style Sheet

Transform is used to convert each online resource to the strict formatted file.(col 3, lines 25-39)

Claim 19 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 5 above.

As to claim 8, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 and that the strict formatted file is a

document object model of one of the online resources. (col 2, lines 46-50)

Claim 22 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 8 above.

As to claims 9 and 23, Maslov teaches the method and system of claims 1 and 15 and that

the analytic parser being a script.(col 6, lines 5-13)

As to claims 10 and 24, Maslov teaches the method of claim 9 and the system of claim 23

teaches the script identifying relevant data via markers within the strict formatted file. (col 4,

lines 41-53)

As to claims 12 and 26, Maslov teaches a method of claim 11 and a system of claim 15

further comprising the step of storing the identified relevant data within a database. (fig 1; col 4,

lines 41-53)

As to claims 13 and 27, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 and the system of claim 15

and automatically notifying a user when the identified relevant data has changed (abstract; col 4,

lines 53-65).

As to claims 14 and 28, Maslov teaches a method of claim 1 and the system of claim 15

further comprising the step of automatically updating a database. (col 4, lines 40-65)

As to claims 31-34, Maslov teaches identifying relevant data in the strict formatted file

comprises identifying data flags or identifiers in the strict architectural structure to identify the

relevant data. (col 4, lines 40-65)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 4, 6, 7, 18, 20, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Maslov (US Patent No 5,946,697) and further in view of Sahota et al (US PGPUB

2005/0114757).

As to claim 4, Maslov teaches the method of claim 3 further comprising the step of

converting the online resource wherein converting the online resource to the strict formatted file

comprises converting the HTML application to the strict formatted file.

However, Maslov does not explicitly indicate converting from the non-hypertext markup

language application to a hyper text markup language application to a HyperText Markup

Language application.

Sahota teaches converting from the hypertext markup language application to a non-hyper text markup language application to a HyperText Markup Language application. More specifically, Sahota teaches transformations from HTML to XML (0060).

It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Sahota into those of Maslov to make the system more flexible. Flexibility of a system can be achieved through the integration of disparate business applications enabling modular interconnection of systems containing data import, export and event monitoring and reporting facilities which are protocol independent. Furthermore, languages like xml and html are more formally referred to a standard generalized markup languages and conform to a particular document type definition where most elements have start tags followed by some content and an end tag.

Claim 18 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 4 above.

As to claim 6, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 but does not explicitly indicate the strict formatted file is an Extensible Markup Language application.

Sahota teaches a method to manage data exchange among systems in a network by translating data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format and vice versa. More specifically, Sahota teaches transformations from html to xml (0060)

It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Sahota into those of Maslov to make the system more flexible. Flexibility of a system can be achieved through the integration of disparate business applications enabling modular interconnection of systems containing data import, export and event monitoring and

reporting facilities which are protocol independent. Furthermore, languages like xml and html

are more formally referred to a standard generalized markup languages and conform to a

particular document type definition where most elements have start tags followed by some

content and an end tag.

Claim 20 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 6 above.

As to claim 7, Maslov teaches the method of claim 1 but does not explicitly indicate the

strict formatted file is an Extensible HypterText Markup Language application.

Sahota teaches a method to manage data exchange among systems in a network by

translating data from a system specific local format to a generic interchange format and vice

versa. More specifically, Sahota teaches transformations from html to xml (0060)

It would have been obvious for one with ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the

teachings of Sahota into those of Maslov to make the system more flexible. Flexibility of a

system can be achieved through the integration of disparate business applications enabling

modular interconnection of systems containing data import, export and event monitoring and

reporting facilities which are protocol independent. Furthermore, languages like xhtml and html

are more formally referred to a standard generalized markup languages and conform to a

particular document type definition where most elements have start tags followed by some

content and an end tag.

Claim 21 is rejected on similar grounds as claim 7 above.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues in substance that Maslov does not teach conversion from a non-strict file to a

strict structured file such as from HTML to XML.

7.   In response, the examiner maintains that Maslov still teaches the claimed limitations as

currently claimed. Maslov explicitly states that the use of DOMs in converting from non-strictly

architectured to strictly architectured files. With specific regard to HTML to XML conversions,

a new reference has been introduced to teach this limitation and the previous rejection

withdrawn. However the independent claims do not recite such limitations so Maslov still

teaches the claims as currently claimed.

Conclusion

8.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Asad M. Nawaz whose telephone number is (571) 272-3988.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AMN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER